REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 19 have been amended. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-22 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Connor et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,912,644 (hereafter O'Connor). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A computer implemented method for creating a translation lookaside buffer entry comprising:
    a)   accessing a *physical memory address* associated with *a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer*;
    b)   *comparing said physical memory address with a predetermined memory range*; and
    c)   if said physical memory address is within said predetermined memory range, invoking an exception. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that O'Connor does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "accessing a *physical memory address* associated with *a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer*," (emphasis added), and, "*comparing said physical memory address with a predetermined memory range*," (emphasis added). In contrast, O'Connor is directed to a translation lookaside buffer or TLB (12) that

receives a virtual address and checks whether the virtual address falls within the range of one of the entries within the TLB (12) instead of being directed to accessing a physical memory address associated with a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. [O'Connor; Col. 2, lines 45-62]. According to O'Connor, if there is an entry in the TLB (12) for the virtual address, the TLB (12) outputs the associated physical address information. Id. That is, the physical address information is accessed from the TLB (12). However, in Independent Claim 1, a physical memory address associated with a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer is accessed. Moreover, in O'Connor, the virtual address is compared with the ranges of the entries within the TLB (12) instead of the physical memory address being compared with a predetermined memory range, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

Thus, O'Connor fails to disclose accessing a physical memory address associated with a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer and fails to disclose comparing the physical memory address with a predetermined memory range, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Connor and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-8 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over O'Connor. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-8 are patentable over O'Connor for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 9 and 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 9 and 15 recite similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claims 9 recites the limitation, "a fill engine for constructing a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry *not entered into a translation lookaside buffer* and for *invoking a comparison between a physical memory address associated with said tentative translation lookaside buffer entry and a predetermined physical memory address range*," (emphasis added). Independent Claims 15 recites the limitations, "accessing a *physical memory address* associated with *a tentative translation lookaside buffer entry not entered into a translation lookaside buffer*," (emphasis added), and, "*comparing said physical memory address with a predetermined memory range*," (emphasis added). As discussed above, O'Connor fails to disclose the cited limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 9 and 15 are not anticipated by O'Connor and are in condition for allowance for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 10-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 9 and 15, respectively, which are allowable over O'Connor. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 10-14 and 16-22 are patentable over O'Connor for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments, and remarks overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 2/3/2006

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060